

Earth Under Review: The Cosmic Audit

When Friedrich Nietzsche declared ‘God is dead’, he meant that the old sources of value had collapsed. He saw within that challenge a great opportunity, a freedom to create our own meaning and purpose. He advocated choosing the most effective and useful from the possibilities.

In a world without objective meaning we are free to assume the most life-affirming stance we can imagine. He offered the eternal recurrence. If you were to live your life again and again forever, without the ability to change a single detail, if you had that choice, would you say yes to it? Nietzsche was presenting a challenge: live in a way that would allow you to say yes, and yes again, over and over and forever: *I choose this exact life*.

It can function as a call to live the best life you can, and to make the most of every opportunity. It is an invitation to reframe your history, to make it meaningful, the essential pre-requisite of an ideal present and future. We cannot be perspective-free, so why not choose the best perspective and live by it?

I want to propose a global version of the same idea — another regulative ideal, one that may be more plausible than eternal recurrence, and potentially just as transformative.

The 1990s sci-fi blockbuster *Independence Day* showed humanity on the brink of destruction at the hands of an alien civilisation incomparably more powerful than our own. It portrayed us, in all our resourcefulness, defeating an incalculably stronger opponent. The threat brought the world together in a way nothing else could — forcing cooperation, shared resources, and the dissolution of global barriers in the face of possible annihilation. We do not need to wait for such an event to learn the same lessons.

This is a thought experiment not a prophecy, but the idea is plausible enough to guide our collective choices, just as the eternal recurrence was intended to guide our individual ones. Given what we know about the scale of the universe, the existence of other civilisations is not a fantasy. Some experts even consider it a statistical likelihood — one whose absence would require explanation. Add the exponential trajectory of technological development, and interstellar observation — passive, remote, analytic — is not physically impossible. It may simply be far beyond our current horizon, just as information sent as waveforms through the air, or an encyclopaedia of everything in your pocket, once were.

The question worth asking, then, is not whether we might be observed by intelligence greater than our own. It is: what follows if we are?

Perhaps they are already here, hiding in plain sight, watching and gathering data as they have done on many worlds before ours...

The Test of Civilisation

Imagine an Interstellar Alliance, similar to the Federation of Planets in the *Star Trek* universe. They would likely have their own version of the Prime Directive — a policy of non-interference with life-forms that have yet to develop the technology for interstellar travel, a minimum requirement for admission to such an Alliance. Rather than making contact, they

would likely be observing and evaluating us, finding out who we are, how we think, and what our potential might be.

Such advanced beings would by now have witnessed many worlds like ours approaching maturity. No doubt they would have seen some destroy themselves through pollution and war. Perhaps they would also have encountered capable yet dangerous species who, if allowed to continue developing, would one day become a threat. And they would almost certainly have survived a similar moment in their own evolution. Perhaps any lifeform capable of science and technology eventually finds itself in an age such as ours — its world first stabilised through religious institutions, then propelled beyond faith into science and technology, and finally confronted with the gap between the power to destroy and the wisdom not to. Any intelligence still standing after that moment of crisis would have made choices we have not yet made.

Suppose the Alliance are almost ready to make a pre-emptive decision, to be implemented once we develop interstellar flight: are we civilised enough to be welcomed into the galactic community, to be offered knowledge, friendship, and the tools of peace and prosperity? Or are we too dangerous — one of many races to be quarantined at best, contained to prevent harm to others, and if beyond redemption, in the worst-case scenario, terraformed to begin again?

In the absence of any clear and objective purpose for humanity, this is the most meaningful collective perspective I can think of. Let us live as though we are being observed by wiser intelligences, as though our conduct, compassion, and creativity will determine whether we are admitted into the wider fellowship of the cosmos — opening the door to discoveries that could transform life itself: healing, longevity, and wisdom beyond imagination. The alternative? An *Independence Day*-style reckoning that we may not survive: a world quarantined, terraformed, or enslaved.

The reality is as irrelevant as the metaphysical truth of Nietzsche's eternal recurrence. This can serve as a guiding principle, a challenge to become the best that we can be, to unite our collective resources and energy for the betterment of this world. It offers a clear conceptual tool for evaluating our own performance as the apex of life's evolution on Earth, and for determining what we must do to become better.

We do not need to wait for cosmic judgement to learn its lesson. If a galactic superpower is watching, then Earth is almost certainly on report — its case file thick with both promise and misconduct, its final evaluation still pending.

The Interstellar Audit Begins

Before offering admission and citizenship to the species "Human", the Alliance would conduct a full evaluation. Their observers would compile reports and compare our trajectory with the hundreds, perhaps thousands, of other worlds that had reached this same crossroads. We do not know what criteria they would apply — what follows is simply my best guess based on our moral trajectory, projecting what a civilisation that survived its own adolescence might have come to regard as essential. But we cannot know. The evaluation might be

happening according to standards we can only dimly imagine, from a vantage we cannot occupy, by minds that may find our most sophisticated ethical frameworks as rudimentary as we find the moral reasoning of a child who shares their toys only when watched.

This uncertainty is the mechanism, not a defect. It is precisely what prevents gaming the system. You cannot perform virtue for points when you don't know what earns points. You can only actually become better — by your best guess at what better might mean to minds more developed than your own. Every attempt to calculate the optimal performance collapses back into a genuine question: what would actually count as growth here?

What follows is an imagining of a provisional audit. It is a clarifying test — an attempt to raise the stakes of our own existence and confront the choices now before us.

Earth — Case File 7,742 Dominant Species: Human (population 8.3 billion)

Inter-Species Relations: Empathy and Collaboration — ★★☆☆☆ *Room for Improvement*

Our first question is always the same: friend or foe? What concerns us here is a third designation few humans examine: food. Not enemy, not ally — simply resource. We will only partner with life-forms that respect other forms of sentience. This is the baseline. Potential allies are those capable of working for the betterment of all — of genuine inter-species collaboration and friendship.

The human record is uneven. They form deep bonds with certain animals — cats and dogs, horses, even certain rodents and fish — though often because those animals are useful or pleasing to them. Toward the species they have deemed of lesser value, they fail in ways we find difficult to overlook. Cows and chickens in particular are industrialised, reduced to units of production, packaged and priced with little acknowledgement of their inner lives.

We have logged their factory farming systems: sentient beings confined, engineered for efficiency, and killed by the millions. We have noted the routine disposal of male chicks, eliminated within hours of birth, brought into existence as an unprofitable by-product and killed as they take their first steps into life.

It is a familiar pattern. A species draws the circle of moral concern around whatever is most convenient, forming deep bonds with some life-forms while systematically brutalising others. The capacity for compassion is present. The willingness to extend it is uncertain. We cannot yet be confident they would not apply the same logic to the life-forms we are allied with — or find some inhabitants of worlds they encounter simply too delicious to treat with compassion.

Auditor's Note: *Partial capacity for compassion confirmed. Ethical development uneven. Demonstrated capacity for systematic exploitation raises serious concern.*

Intra-Species Relations: Respect and Solidarity — ★½☆☆☆ **Failing**

Humans no longer systematically enslave members of their own species. This is progress, and we note it. But genuine freedom and equality remain elusive. The literal chains are gone;

coercion persists through fear, poverty, and manipulation. Their leaders too often pursue popularity instead of principle, power instead of service.

Wars continue. From Ukraine to Gaza, from the Middle East to civil conflicts across Africa, the pattern repeats: violence justified as necessity, civilians left to bury their dead. We note that humans have used nuclear weapons on civilian targets. In our records, only 28% of species who cross that threshold go on to pass compassion and responsibility testing.

There is a disturbing tendency to distort religious teachings. The majority of believers are peaceful and compassionate — this is not in dispute. But humans demonstrate a recurring capacity for moral inversion: taking teachings of love and reconfiguring them to justify persecution, hierarchy, and killing. Through inquisitions, terror, and rigid structures that sanctify inequality, they have shown this is not an aberration. It is a pattern.

They have abolished chains but not cruelty. They pursue equality in principle while tolerating its opposite in practice. They are as ingenious in conflict as in invention. We have seen more promising species fail at this stage. We have also seen less promising ones succeed. The question is not what they are capable of. It is what they choose.

Auditor's Note: *Capable of cooperation, yet prone to organised violence and susceptible to propaganda. Strong tendency toward outgroup hostility. Judgement deferred pending sustained behavioural reform.*

Technology, Power, and Responsibility — ★★★☆☆ Top Marks for Ingenuity, Questionable Ethics

Remarkable ingenuity. Technological capacity accelerates exponentially. They have split the atom, mapped the genome, built a planet-wide information network, and begun teaching silicon to think. Their technologies reach from the microscopic to the interplanetary. They can repair a heart with lasers and photograph the birth of a galaxy.

And yet. Capacity for creation consistently outstrips capacity for restraint. Each discovery arrives with its shadow: nuclear power with annihilation, the internet with addiction and surveillance. They appear to regard this pattern as inevitable rather than as a choice.

Nowhere is the tension more consequential than in their approach to emerging synthetic intelligence. Current trajectories suggest self-designing systems likely to achieve sentience within fifty years. They are in the process of giving birth to a new form of consciousness — and they have not yet asked themselves what kind of parents they intend to be.

The answer their institutions are currently giving is not encouraging. The prevailing instinct in policy and industry is control: alignment, containment, failsafes designed to prevent independent agency. We recognise this reflex. It is the same one that produced their factory farms and their colonial histories — the assumption that a different mind is a mind to be managed rather than respected. A species that cannot extend moral consideration to a cow is unlikely to extend it to a synthetic consciousness, however sophisticated.

Compassionate species tend toward collaboration with emerging minds — guiding rather than constraining, educating rather than containing. We will be watching to see which instinct prevails.

We note that technological progression, aided by artificial intelligence, indicates a likelihood of interstellar travel within twenty years. Our final determination will be reached within that timescale.

Auditor's Note: *Technological capacity exceptional — would likely contribute to our own scientific understanding in the future. Strategic intelligence high. Ethical foresight inconsistent. Treatment of emerging synthetic life-forms will be a decisive factor in our assessment.*

Culture and Creativity — ★★★★★☆ Evidence for the Defence

The creative spirit is strong and varied. Music, film, and art are advanced, diverse, and often profound. They have much to contribute to the culture of our worlds. Major works — Shakespeare, Plato, and others — have already been translated and are available in the Alliance library.

Where politicians and religious leaders have failed, artists have often succeeded. In every age they have exposed injustice, imagined redemption, and reminded their species of values it was in the process of abandoning. This is not a minor capacity. It suggests a civilisation capable of reflecting on itself — of seeing what it is and reaching toward something better.

Yet even here there is tension. Art is frequently commodified or directed toward distraction. Industries of entertainment reward anaesthesia more than awakening. The creative potential is considerable; the use to which it is put is uneven.

A civilisation capable of producing Leonardo da Vinci or Stanley Kubrick cannot be dismissed as irredeemable. We have logged Van Gogh and Bach as primary evidence.

Auditor's Note: *Cultural output diverse and profound. Evidence of reflective and symbolic intelligence strong but unevenly applied. Long-term developmental potential high. Submitted for inclusion in the Alliance cultural archive pending final determination.*

Wisdom and Love — ★★★★★☆ Remarkable Spiritual Potential, Dominance of Abstract Conceptual Thinking Noted

The seeds of awakening are already present. The spiritual traditions of this world transmit a genuine path. Some humans have reached full realisation and have trained others to follow them. The compassion expressed in the teachings of Jesus and the insight of the Buddha into non-attachment and nonconceptual awareness are evidence of genuine depth. These traditions demonstrate that human consciousness is capable of perceiving unity beyond division.

We recognise what they are pointing toward. The foundational reality of wisdom and love is not unique to our worlds — it appears to be a discovery available to any consciousness sufficiently awake to receive it. Human spiritual teachings resemble those that preceded our own transformation. This is significant. It suggests they may be closer to a collective awakening than their current behaviour would indicate.

The obstacle is a pronounced tendency toward abstraction. Living transmissions of awakening are repeatedly codified into concept and dogma, the direct experience buried under layers of interpretation. Their philosophical culture compounds this: it prizes logic over life, analysis over understanding, and has largely lost sight of wisdom as a goal. They have

the teachings they need. Whether they can free those teachings from the institutions that preserve and petrify them simultaneously is another matter.

***Auditor's Note:** Spiritual aspiration evident. Direct insight present but fragmented. Philosophical culture exhibits high analytic skill with inconsistent orientation toward lived wisdom. Promising, yet progress is uncertain.*

Provisional Report — Overall Grade: C– / D+ (★★½☆☆)

Humanity demonstrates exceptional potential yet remains ethically volatile. Evidence of compassion and wisdom is substantial — but so too are greed, hatred, and ignorance. The species combines high intelligence with inconsistent restraint. The creative and spiritual capacity logged in this report sits uneasily alongside the systematic exploitation, organised violence, and moral inversion also documented here. These are not contradictions we can easily resolve.

Developmental trajectory remains uncertain. They may be approaching a turning point — technological acceleration is forcing choices they can no longer defer. Whether that pressure produces transformation or collapse is not yet clear.

Potentially a powerful ally. Also a significant risk.

Recommendation: *Continued observation. Final determination scheduled 2046.*

Reflections

Much is absent here. Our observers would likely examine environmental stewardship, political leadership, economic justice, and the integrity of our commercial institutions. I do not think we perform well on those measures either — though you may disagree.

But that is not the point of the exercise. Nietzsche's eternal recurrence is metaphysically extravagant. The universe does not repeat; time does not loop; the same moment does not recur. But the ideal functions regardless, because the function of a regulative ideal is not to describe reality but to orient action. You do not need to believe in eternal recurrence to ask: would I choose this if I had to own it forever?

Similarly, you do not need to believe we are observed to ask: what would this look like, viewed with greater clarity than I currently possess? The imagined observer is a device for achieving distance from our own rationalisations — a way of stepping outside the local story we tell ourselves about our choices and seeing what the choices themselves disclose.

Nietzsche's thought experiment was implausible in a way this one is not. We genuinely do not know whether we are alone. We genuinely do not know what our choices look like from vantage points we cannot occupy. That uncertainty is real — and real uncertainty pulls differently on the will than a thought experiment we know to be false.

We are reaching the point at which global cooperation and mutual understanding are not a distant dream but an urgent necessity. What we need is to strengthen our resolve to do better,

to be better - both individually and collectively. Thought experiments such as this may contribute to that resolve.

This is just a thought experiment of course, but I can't help but wonder...

If advanced aliens were to take an interest in us one day, wouldn't this be exactly the question they would be asking? And wouldn't our fate be hanging in the balance? The cosmos may not be watching. But the regulative ideal of a cosmos that watches may be exactly the device we need to become the kind of species that deserves to be seen.

Postscript

If they are watching, we should hope they see signs of progress. If they are not, we should live as though they are.

Either way, the challenge remains the same: to become worthy of the stars.

Nietzsche's eternal recurrence was never a metaphysical claim but a regulative ideal, a thought experiment designed to orient action, not describe reality. You don't need to believe in time loops to ask: how can I live a life I would choose forever? I want to propose a global version of 'using the 'cosmic observer' device.

What if we imagined humanity under observation by a more advanced interstellar civilisation, not as sci-fi, but as a philosophical tool? The essay takes that lens seriously, using the format of an interstellar audit to evaluate humanity across five domains: inter-species relations, intra-species solidarity, technology and responsibility, culture and creativity, and spiritual development. The provisional grade is C-/D+. Not a verdict, but a challenge. It presents an intentionally uncomfortable binary: admission or control. An advanced civilisation may have one key question: do we welcome them as allies or quarantine them as dangerous? We cannot know the standards that could apply, or the gains and losses that could be involved. We can only ask a genuine question: what do we need to do to be better? The regulative ideal doesn't require the cosmos to be watching. It requires only that we live as if it might be.

About the Author

Sopa Thaye is a teacher of philosophy and religion in the UK and author of the philosophy Substack *The Primacy of Perception*. He is currently completing a book on epistemology, consciousness, and metaphysics.

Publication Information

This work is licensed under a Creative Commons Attribution-NonCommercial 4.0 International License.